

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 50, No. 2

OCTOBER 19, 1956

WHOLE No. 1213

CAESAR

Papers presented at the Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Baltimore, Maryland, April 27 and 28, 1956, Commemorating the Bimillennium of the Death of Julius Caesar.

CONTENTS

W. H. RUSSELL, <i>Caesar, the General</i>	17
S. W. GERBER, <i>The Importance of the Caesar Semester</i>	19
E. L. KAYSER, <i>Julius Caesar—Politician or Statesman?</i>	20
H. W. BENARIO, <i>Caesar, Propaganda, and the Poets</i>	22
P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON, <i>Gaius Julius Caesar and Roman Law</i>	24
W. T. AVERY, <i>Caesar, The Man of Letters</i>	26
C. W. SIEDLER, <i>Rhetorical Devices in Caesar's Commentaries</i>	28
EDITORIAL NOTE	32
BOOKS RECEIVED	32

CAESAR, THE GENERAL

By way of concluding the formal presentation this afternoon let us think together about a remark by William Saroyan to the effect that when man forgets the past, he is forced to relive it.

In this concept Caesar is apposite. At his birth Rome stood in the twilight of her career as a community of laws as opposed to arbitrary power. When Caesar died, Rome had already recognized the predominance of alegal anarchy. Those of us already in middle age (if I may use an ugly term) have also lived through a transition from the twilight of international law into a period where the nations depend too much on arbitrary power. Now you may call this analogy irrelevant because Caesar himself contributed materially to the transition in his own time; but even if you are not directly responsible for the tragic change during our time each of us shares the obligation to understand it. Perhaps by analyzing Caesar's generalship we can learn to revert from relying so heavily upon military violence, for as a campaigner Caesar used military power with a restraint we can well emulate.

Before we examine directly Caesar's campaigns in the Civil Wars, think with me for a minute about the similarities between his time and our own. Pompey had just completed the long evolution from the great Alexander where-

by military force evolved into an instrument for controlling Europe and the Middle East. Yet, like our own George McClellan, Pompey knew how to create such a force but not how to use it. In the years before absolute power corrupted him, Caesar employed the then new kind of armed force in a way that foreshadowed St. Augustine's doctrine for setting ethical limits to the use of armed violence. Since Augustine's pattern offers our best hope for peace, we will do well to analyze Caesar's generalship at the onset of the same conditions which later inspired Augustine. In the process we may throw some light on how to apply Augustine's doctrine in our own era of international anarchy, and at the same time determine where Caesar lost his way. For, if Saroyan be sound, only thus can 20th century man escape the penalty of reliving his past.

We are interested, then, in the Caesar who subdued Gaul and then applied during the Civil Wars his hard lessons from the frontier. Putting together what we have heard today about the Gallic Wars we observe that throughout ten years on the frontier Caesar recognized certain fundamental concepts, and gave them form by his cumulative action. Indeed at the outset of the Civil Wars one may say that Caesar recognized four basic principles for applying military force:

1. He considered combat as merely an extension of civil policy by violent means;

2. Therefore, he used military violence to wreak on an enemy the minimum havoc consistent with fulfilling his civil policy;

3. However, he recognized that economic strength — and specifically adequate supplies — determined the capacity of a combat force to sustain consistent civil policy;

4. So he believed that when confronting a respectable enemy his own combat units had to assail whatever enemy force posed a real threat to his economic strength or to his own supply facilities.

Let us turn now to the Civil Wars, and see if we can determine how thoroughly Caesar adhered to these principles and whether they can help us work through a similar problem.

Whether the predominant urge to cross the Rubicon in January 49 B.C. was selfish or civic, Caesar recognized that he could not succeed till order had been restored in Italy. To fulfill this civil policy he needed soldiers and he needed to convince the people that normalcy had been restored. Toward those twin ends he entered Italy with a negligible force, moved more rapidly than his opponents believed possible, used the combination of force and public opinion to disarm organized opposition, and then made a great display of magnanimous forgiveness. Within two months he had pushed Pompey into the port of Brundisium, in Italy's southeast corner, had opened the roads to normal travel, and won control of the central power at Rome. All of these things Caesar accomplished by insisting that his troops wreak as little havoc as was consistent with restoring order.

Despite this brilliant initial success, Caesar knew that as long as Pompey held Brundisium and as long as Pompey could bring there the fleets and resources from the wealthy east, for just so long could Pompey disrupt normal economic life in the Italian peninsula. So Caesar set out, as he said, to convince Pompey that he should leave Italy and cross the Adriatic. Since Caesar's whole policy hinged on winning that particular military objective, he applied as much force as he could muster and as violently as he was able. Pompey's withdrawal across the Adriatic into Albania ended Phase One of the Civil Wars.

Phase Two required nine months and encompassed Caesar's most statesmanlike performance. All of his success hinged upon refurbishing Italy's economic life before the temporary glow of initial victory wore off. He had to end a deflationary depression much like our own of 1929, as well as to re-establish both the

inflow of imported grain and the outflow of goods and services. To check the depression, Caesar introduced promptly money policies foreshadowing the Roosevelt New Deal. Thus debtors paid and creditors spent their money promptly in fear of greater deflation, thereby affording Caesar precious time. To bring in grain and open markets Caesar became the general again. He won back Spain from Pompey's agents and opened an easy sea route to Gaul. Though his lieutenants failed to win back Africa, their combined efforts insured for Rome a viable economy and gave Caesar the general a logistical base that would remain secure for at least six months, in which he must wrest from Pompey the empire's wealthier half.

By December 49 Caesar had accomplished a near miracle. By combining diplomacy, moderation, and an occasional hard combat, he had conjured up the minimum economic strength,

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from October for sixteen (16) issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 50 (1956-57) contains issues dated October 5, 19, 26; November 16, 30; December 14 (1956); January 7, 14; February 4, 25; March 4, 11, 25, April 8, 29; May 6 (1957).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S. \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If Affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S.; whose members may also take *Classical Outlook*, *Classical Journal*, and *Classical Bulletin* at special prices in combination available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., Prof. F. Gordon Stockin, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

STAFF

EDITOR

Edward A. Robinson Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Herbert W. Benario Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
 Louis H. Feldman Yeshiva University, New York 33, N. Y.
 Evelyn B. Harrison Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
 Richard M. Haywood New York University, New York 53, N. Y.
 Martin Ostwald Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
 John F. Reilly Sacred Heart High School, Yonkers, N. Y.
 William H. Stahl Brooklyn College, Brooklyn 10, N. Y.

as well as sound lines of military supply, for assailing Pompey's stronghold across the Adriatic. Yet his success could be but temporary, for Pompey controlled large fleets which could, come summer, undo everything Caesar had accomplished. Therefore Caesar had merely bought himself a few months respite in which he had to dig out a competent general dominating what was then the world's richest resources area. That he succeeded emphasizes our earlier suggestion about Pompey's almost blind adherence to an outworn system. With a large fleet as tender and restricted in range as are modern aircraft, Pompey persisted in holding it quite apart from his ground forces. Since the fleet could not reach even moderate efficiency till spring, Pompey planned to spend his winter training troops. To win, all Caesar had to do was conduct an unprecedented amphibious campaign in the dead of winter and with a force apparently hopelessly inferior. He succeeded by relying upon a policy of controlling briefly only such small areas of hostile sea and land as he absolutely needed, and then exploiting the enemy's monolithic inflexibility.

A few days after the year 48 began, Caesar had embarked half his force, led it across a wintry sea, landed on a rocky shore, and proceeded boldly to cut off Pompey's fleet from essential land bases. After narrowly losing the race for Pompey's main base on the Adriatic coast at Dyrrhachium, Caesar had Antony bring over the rest of his army, joined the two forces, and blocked Pompey against the sea where his winter-bound ships could supply him with difficulty. Pompey escaped by mounting a brilliant amphibious counter-attack, but Caesar then extricated a beaten army by daring marches into the heart of Pompey's country where his opponent had to follow. Finally at Pharsalus Caesar resurrected an age-old cavalry tactic, made it look new, and surprised an overconfident Pompey into shocked defeat.

Taken by itself, the winter campaign from Brundisium to Pharsalus compares favorably with anything accomplished by Alexander, Scipio Africanus, Cromwell, Marlborough, Napoleon, Bedford Forrest, or George Patton. Indeed only Alexander managed to combine so skillfully the techniques of amphibious assault, amphibious defense, and conventional land campaigning. Yet beyond these considerations, Caesar's winter campaign is virtually unique. Victory depended upon nearly perfect tactical performance at each step, as well as upon completing all steps before the weather unleashed Pompey's fleet. Indeed only prompt word of un-

expected victory at Pharsalus enabled Caesar's lieutenants to hold three sea bases on which depended the hastily bolstered Roman economy. Then to cap this magnificent campaign, Caesar perceived that at Pharsalus he had won enough to insure victory. He foreswore the revenge implicit in unconditional surrender, foregave the Pompeians who surrendered, and ended the hot phase of the Civil Wars. That he undertook immediately the cold war necessary to fulfill his civil policies was not anti-climactic, but rather a measure of Caesar's grasp of the realities of life in a world committed to alegal anarchy. I wish we could say that he resisted the temptations inherent in absolute power, but even that subsequent failure does not invalidate the lessons offered by Caesar's performance through his victory at Pharsalus.

After ten years in Gaul where he learned the trade of generalship by passing slowly through the stages of apprentice, journeyman, and master — I say after ten such years Caesar became in the Civil Wars a teacher, or, to use the more formal term, a doctor. Even though absolute power later corroded his skill, he taught his students to stave chaos off for some 300 years. And perhaps after 2,000 years he can teach us the same lesson, if we will but analyze carefully his doctoral work.

W. H. RUSSELL

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CAESAR SEMESTER

The current course of study in Latin for secondary schools has placed the reading of Caesar in a pivotal position. In most schools, the first three semesters of Latin are devoted to the teaching of basic grammar and vocabulary and the reading of "made Latin." In the case of students who plan to take only two years of Latin—and they are, unfortunately, the majority of high school Latin students—the one semester that is given to the reading of Caesar is the terminal course in Latin. In the case of students who are considering whether they should continue their study of Latin for a third year, the interest aroused in the Caesar class may be the determining factor in their decision.

Since it is impossible in any case to read all of the *Commentaries* in one semester, it is necessary for the teacher to make a selection. If the teacher starts at the beginning and reads straight through as far as time permits, the class will inevitably have read some material that is of little interest and will have omitted

some material which is of great interest. It would therefore be desirable for the teacher to select those passages which can capture the imagination of students and hold their interest, and to reject any material that cannot qualify as to this criterion.

The following are illustrative passages capable of holding the interest of students:

1. The situation that prevailed in Caesar's army before the battle with Ariovistus and Caesar's masterful handling of it. (1.39-54)

2. The battle with the Nervii and Caesar's tribute to the courage of the enemy. (2.16-28)

3. The reaction of the Aduatuci to Caesar's siegeworks and Caesar's treatment of this tribe when they violated the terms of surrender (2.29-33)

4. The invasion of Britain and the part played by the standard bearer of the Tenth Legion. (4.20-26)

5. The disaster that befell the two legions commanded by Sabinus and Cotta. (5.26-37)

6. The valor of Quintus Cicero and his legion. (5.38-52)

7. The strange animals in the Hercynian forest, particularly those that are called "*alces*." (6.26-28)

8. The reference to Lutetia: "*oppidum Parisiorum positum in insula fluminis Sequanae*." (7.57)

9. The revolt of the Gauls under Vercingetorix; Caesar's siegeworks at Alesia. (7.1-4, 68-90)

There is such a wealth of interesting reading material in the *Commentaries* that many other selections will suggest themselves to teachers. Consequently there is no need for the reading of Caesar for even a single day to consist of material that is dull. What is at stake in the reading of Caesar is not only the student's impression of a classical author's writing but also his decision to continue or not to continue the study of Latin.

SYLVIA W. GERBER

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

JULIUS CAESAR—POLITICIAN OR STATESMAN?

It is quite natural in an election year to inquire whether a given public man is a politician or a statesman. Granted that most office seekers run as politicians on the promise of being statesmen, we are on uneasy ground when

we try to set up definitions. Let us say a politician is one who strives for place, for the sake of place: a statesman one who uses place for the attainment of constructive ends. We assume that the politician is a master of the devices of his craft, that a statesman has the mental endowment as well as the desire to set up and strive for worthy, even monumental, objectives.

Was Caesar a politician or a statesman? Writing just a century ago, Theodor Mommsen declared with magisterial finality that "Caesar was a statesman in the deepest sense of the term, and his aim was the highest which man is allowed to propose to himself."¹ Sixty years later, Ferrero, with greater restraint, praised in Caesar the politician's "grandiose imagination, the prodigious lucidity of his intellect, his indefatigable activity, his inexhaustible fund of nervous energy," but declared that he could not find in Caesar's career the great master plan for the restoration of "the crumbling fabric of the Roman state." "But," says the historian, "if we must deny that his work had any organic, still more any miraculously prophetic, significance, this does not affect our estimate of his greatness."²

Among our contemporaries, Sir William Tarn takes a position not so distant from that of Ferrero when he declares that "on what is known, he was a good general, a clever politician and a useful, but *not* a great, statesman."³ Arnold Toynbee, however, is back with Mommsen when he declares (referring to the years spent in Gaul): "he grew in political and moral stature till even his bitterest enemies were compelled to recognize him, in their heart of hearts, as the one possible Savior of Society."⁴

As just read, these appraisals by modern historians seem to suggest considerable divergence in view. When, however, they are read in their context from which, by necessity, we have had to lift them, the amount of divergence decreases. That Caesar was a politician and an able and adroit one, none can doubt. His role in the formation and launching of the First Triumvirate is certainly evidence of amazing expertness in this field. That he became something more than a bell ringer and ward heeler

1. Theodor Mommsen, *The History of Rome* (trans. W. P. Dickson; Everyman Edition) IV 426.

2. Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagnolo, *A Short History of Rome* (New York 1918) I 481-482.

3. Sir Ernest Barker, Sir George Clark, Paul Vaucher (edd.), *The European Inheritance* (Oxford 1954) I 217.

4. Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History* (Oxford 1934-54) III 274.

will likewise be allowed. It is fair, then, since the politician in the early Caesar is so easily documented, to ask when did this change occur, when did Caesar pass into a sphere where he can be adjudged on the basis of statesmanship? That point seems also pretty well documented as coinciding with Caesar's departure for the command in Gaul. Less than a year before Cicero had written: "If I can make Caesar, who is now sailing gaily before the wind, a better patriot too, shall I be doing so poor a service to the country?"⁵

Not Cicero but circumstances account for the change. In Plutarch's familiar words, "After this, he [Caesar] seems to begin his course afresh and to enter upon a new life and scene of action."⁶ It is in that new life of some thirteen years, that we must look for the answer to our question.

By the time that Caesar received his extraordinary command it was perfectly clear that continued defiance of precedent, and not by Caesar alone, had broken down all constitutional form. The Republic obviously was ending. The command in Gaul gave Caesar the chance to build the military machine which could implement his political plans and enable him to compete on a favorable basis with his fellow triumvirs. Gaul gave Caesar more than large scale military experience. It gave him large scale experience in administration. It kept him out of the day by day politics of the city (and maybe this was a large factor in bringing about the changed Caesar). It gave him the point of vantage, the resources and the military power which enabled him to work on a different level, a level more congenial to real statesmanship.

The value of the experience and the armed power which Gaul had developed was demonstrated in the Civil War between Caesar and the Senate. It is really, however, to those last two years, from 28 July, 46, to 15 March, 44 B.C., that we must look for the real answer to our question: was Caesar a politician or a statesman? He had attained the politician's goal. He had attained preeminent place. Those who might challenge him on his own level were no more. Only the Spanish revolt from autumn 46 to spring 45 was to break the universal and unquestioned control of the dictator during those last two years.

It was obvious that the old formulas could not be used, that a rehabilitation of old institu-

tions would not meet the problem of the new Empire. Offices, honors, powers were heaped on him, not too unwillingly. There could be no other depository for them. In him, *de facto*, was the plenitude of power and that power was bound to find expression and representation in all forms, in all idioms, and not all of them traditionally Roman.

Caesar's task was to absorb them, to reinterpret them, and to transform them. It might possibly involve redistributing them or consolidating them and arranging for their easy transmission to a successor. Perhaps, Tarn oversimplified when he insists that the two major problems, the impossibility of a city-state ruling an empire and need of civilian control over the military, were never touched.⁷

Granted, from our vantage point, that these were the great needs, we must remember that preceding Caesar there had been almost a century of marked civil disturbance, much of it revolutionary in character. The broad lines of a Sullan reform would certainly not have met the issue. There was a necessary period of clean-up and Caesar's record here is good. His restoration of order, his reform of the dole, his settlement of the veterans, his municipal reforms, while in themselves not justifying a claim to the very highest statesmanship, are at least in accord with the good judgment that handles first things first.

Where Caesar would have gone from there is what we can never know. As Mommsen pronounces his panegyric, we are impressed with the weight of what Caesar *might* have done, had he lived:⁸

The outlines have thus been set forth which Caesar drew for this work, according to which he labored himself, and according to which posterity—for many centuries confined to the paths which this great man marked out—endeavored to prosecute the work, if not with the intellect and energy, yet on the whole in accordance with the intentions of the illustrious master.⁹

As one reads these century old words of Mommsen, he cannot help recalling the letter that Cicero wrote to Atticus less than two months after the assassination: "Now, whichever way we turn, we are reminded not only of Caesar's enactments but also of his intentions."¹⁰

For the historian, intentions are difficult

5. Att. 2.1.6 (trans. E. O. Winstedt [L.C.L.]).

6. Caes. 15 ("Dryden" trans., rev. A. H. Clough; Everyman Edition, II 541).

7. Barker, Clark, Vaucher, *The European Inheritance* (see Note 3) I 217.

8. Mommsen, *op. cit.* (see Note 1) II 424-327.

9. *Ibid.* II 526.

10. Att. 14.17.6 (trans. Winstedt; see Note 5).

materials with which to work. Unfortunately, those intentions were never put to work by Caesar. His death reopened civil disturbance, long protracted, and the future of the Empire was to be shaped by a new ruler who was vouchsafed fifty years in the service of the state.

That the day of the Republic was over must certainly have been apparent to Caesar and to all but a few unreconstructed Brutuses. If, in the logic of history, a total demolition was necessary, Caesar was certainly history's agent. If it were necessary for one man to absorb in himself the totality of power in order to transmit it to another, Caesar did that too, but the transition was a troubled one. Maybe even Cleopatra owed something to Caesar for the part that she played in that transmission.

We have not been concerned with the character of Caesar, except as it conditioned his performance. The Roman historians are frank enough to convince us that he was no worse than his times, and most possibly much better. Well endowed with social charm and mental cultivation, he remained the realist in action. In a period that developed politicians, he became a highly successful politician. It is evident that his full potential was not used up in his struggle for place. The elaborate political base that he laid could have supported the amplest statesmanship. Attempting to appraise after two thousand years, we still cannot say the last word. About all that we can say is that the edifice was never completed. What we know of the foundation, of the superstructure as far as it went, all indicates that the completed structure would have been of the same order.

As I remember, Brunellesco designed and started the Pitti Palace in Florence but did not live to complete it. Yet, today, we consider the Pitti Palace a masterpiece of Brunellesco. So let it be with Caesar.

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CAESAR, PROPAGANDA, AND THE POETS

During the first part of Caesar's proconsular term as governor of Gaul, his position as a power in the state was still in the stage of development. The unofficial coalition which he had been instrumental in forging in 60 B.C. had left him, unquestionably, the junior member of the group. It is true that he was, during his year as consul, of more immediate service to his partners than they to him, but his *dignitas*,

the defense of which, more than a decade later, was the prime factor in initiating civil war, had not yet begun to rival that of Pompey and Crassus. The latter were both his seniors in age, both had been victorious in armed conflicts, Pompey had been possessor of the widest *imperium* ever yet granted a Roman, Crassus censor and still possessor of a vast fortune and a tremendous number of clients, a powerful force in any political undertaking. Further, Caesar's relative position was weakened even more by his absence from Rome, while Pompey and Crassus remained in the city and were thus able to sample and mold public opinion with greater expediency and effect. Perhaps the most important instance wherein Pompey thus gained benefits in prestige was his support of the bill which recalled Cicero from exile.

Syme has remarked that "The purpose of propaganda was threefold—to win an appearance of legality for measures of violence, to seduce the supporters of a rival party and to stampede the neutral or non-political elements."¹ Caesar was able to accomplish none of these goals during the first half of the decade of the fifties; the only one he could perhaps hope to effect was the last. Granted that, in Adcock's words, "public opinion was made by what senators said in the Senate or in private or wrote to their friends,"² still it was the *factio* of the most powerful element of the senate that Caesar had undertaken to combat, and it would be in the tribal assembly that most of his support would be found. As a result, his reputation among the rank-and-file of the citizenry would be of the utmost importance. And it was precisely here that he ran into what was tantamount to a stone wall, for it appears that practically all of the major poets, those men who, by one melodious phrase, can forever damn an object of their enmity, were bitterly opposed to him.

Their attacks were not only violent but filthy, and they bit deeply both into Caesar's reputation and his feelings. In many propaganda outbursts, these results did not necessarily follow; Cicero's brutal diatribe against Vatinius, for example, did not prevent the latter from remaining on cordial terms with him thereafter. But against the poets Caesar could make no reply; he could only endeavor to conciliate them and win them

1. Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 154.

2. F. E. Adcock, *Caesar as Man of Letters* (Cambridge 1956) 21.

to his support. Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.34) makes Cremutius Cordus, in his defense before Tiberius on the charge of writing in praise of Brutus and Cassius, remark:

The poems of Bibaculus and Catullus which are crammed with insults of the Caesars [*referta contumeliis*] are still read; but the deified Julius and the deified Augustus themselves both endured those things and let them remain; whether with greater moderation than wisdom, I would not easily say.

Suetonius adds that Caesar

never formed such bitter enmities that he was not glad to lay them aside when opportunity offered. Although Gaius Memmius had made highly caustic speeches against him, to which he had replied with equal bitterness, he went so far as to support Memmius afterwards in his suit for the consulship. When Gaius Calvus, after some scurrilous epigrams [*famosa epigrammata*], took steps through his friends towards a reconciliation, Caesar wrote to him first and of his own free will. Valerius Catullus, as Caesar himself did not hesitate to say, inflicted a lasting stain [*perpetua stigmata*] on his name by the verses about Mamurra; yet when he apologized, Caesar invited the poet to dinner that very same day, and continued his usual friendly relations with Catullus' father.³

We do not have the time to consider all the members of that group of young poets whom Cicero scornfully dubbed the *neôteroi*, the *poetae novi*, who were united not only by the desire to introduce the artificiality of Alexandrian poetry into Rome but also by their opposition to that segment of the *nobiles* which was then most influential in the state. Only Suetonius' two need delay us, Calvus because of his opposition in oration as well as verse, Catullus because we have the poems *referta contumeliis*. Of Calvus' no doubt abundant output we have but a bit more than one line against Caesar, wherein he calls attention to the suspected improper relations between Caesar and Nicomedes of Bithynia in 81 (*Suet. Iul.* 49.1: Bithynia quicquid/et pedicator Caesaris umquam habuit).

Catullus' contributions to the anti-Caesarian cause are often masterpieces of the art of saying much in a few easily-remembered verses. He did not limit himself to outbursts against the person of Caesar alone, but attacked his subordinates and his colleague Pompey as well. *Carmina* 29 and 57, together, in all likelihood, with 41 and 43, are the ones about Mamurra referred to by Suetonius; the first ends with the lines, addressed to the two triumvirs, "eone nomine . . . /socer generque, perdidistis omnia?" "Did you,

o father and son-in-law, on this account destroy everything?" It has been suggested that the *Mentula* of *Carmina* 94, 105, 114, and 115 was Labienus, Caesar's outstanding marshal. *Carmen* 93 was probably written after Caesar had undertaken to seek a reconciliation, and must rank with the distich on his love for Lesbia (85) for concentrated feeling:

Nil nimium studeo, Caesar, tibi velle placere,
nec scire utrum sis albus an ater homo.

"I have no particular desire, Caesar, to wish to please you, nor to know whether you are black or white."

The two lines which are customarily found attached to number 54 must likewise have followed an effort by Caesar to induce Catullus at least to tone down the venom of the Mamurra poems:

Irascere iterum meis iambis
Immerentibus, unice imperator.

"You will a second time be angered by my undeserving verses, thou nonpareil general."

These poetic attacks were written both before and after the council of Luca in 56, which extended and advanced the agreements of the early triumvirate and strengthened Caesar's position. Evidently, then, it gradually became clear that opposition to Caesar was not too wise a course, and he was successful in winning the poets over, if not to active support, at least to silence. Indeed, his exploits in Gaul became an object of fancy, as did his invasion of Britain, and furnished Bibaculus and Publius Terentius Varro of Narbo themes for epics. Catullus apparently died too soon to do Caesar any service, and whether Calvus wrote any palinodes is unknown. We do know that he defended a Caesarian tribune, Gaius Cato, in July 54.

There is one important name which we have not yet mentioned. This is Cicero, in his youth, according to Plutarch, the best poet in Rome, and still, in the fifties, an active and skillful versifier, if not worthy of extraordinary distinction in the genre. As an admirer of Ennius and the old school of Latin poetry, his sympathies were certainly not in line with the *neôteroi*, though their political leanings might, on the whole, parallel his. Did his pen contribute any poems in favor of or opposed to the Caesarian cause?

Two of his efforts deserve our attention. Totally lost, but perfectly clear in its intent, is the epic which Cicero composed toward the end of 54 on Caesar's campaign in Britain. We

3. *Suet. Iul.* 73 (trans. J. C. Rolfe [L.C.L.]).

can follow its career from the first burst of enthusiasm to the difficulty of putting words on paper. In June, he requests his brother Quintus to give him details so that the picture may be drawn with the latter's colors but his own brush (*Q. Fr.* 2.13.2). In September, he has broken off, for the sources of inspiration have run dry—*ipsi fontes iam sitiunt* (3.1.4.11). By the end of November, Caesar has heard of the undertaking, and, at his brother's request, Cicero begins anew (3.6(8).3) and, in the next month, the poem is finished (3.7(9).6). In light of the fact that, when he was in the mood, he could write as many as five hundred verses a night, this must really have been a rush job. Undoubtedly we have suffered no great loss in the failure of the poem to be preserved.⁴

Quite different, however, is the poem which Cicero composed in honor of Marius. Not even a dozen and a half lines remain; the only substantial fragment runs to thirteen lines. The date of composition has long been an open question; suggestions range from the end of 87, after Marius' return from exile, to 52. It seems extremely unlikely that a young man who had associated with such as Lucius Crassus, Marcus Antonius, and the two Scaevolae would send forth an encomium in honor of the revolutionary leader: the fifties seem a much more reasonable period. But just when?

If the poem falls in the period between 56 and 52, it has no extraordinary significance for us, for it will then parallel his epic and the recantations of Calvus, Bibaculus, and others. If, however, it is earlier in date, it can indicate something special.

In a letter to Atticus of April 59 (*Att.* 2.15.3), Cicero quotes a line of verse which I feel is to be assigned to his *Marius* (in *montes patrios et ad incunabula nostra*). The poem is then to be placed in the first quarter of this year; its purpose would be not only to offer praise to Cicero's fellow-Arpinate, but also to do honor to Caesar, then consul for the first time, through his uncle by marriage. The resurrection of Marius' name and reputation had been one of Caesar's main efforts during the previous decade, and we would thus find Cicero using a subject amenable to himself to subtly maintain cordiality towards Caesar.⁵

4. On the problems surrounding this poem, see Walter Allen, Jr., "The British Epics of Quintus and Marcus Cicero," *TAPA* 86 (1955) 143-159.

5. This view is presented in detail in an article to appear in a forthcoming number of *CP*.

If this suggestion is valid, we find that not all of the poets who concerned themselves with political life were totally in opposition to Caesar prior and immediately subsequent to Luca. And yet Cicero's mild expression of favor could hardly outweigh the keener thrusts of the younger poets; the picture offered by Suetonius and Tacitus need not be changed.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY HERBERT W. BENARIO

GAIUS JULIUS CAESAR AND ROMAN LAW

It has been estimated not only from epigraphical sources but also from ancient authors' statements that Caesar in his five years of attested legislative action (59, 51, 49, 46, 45) either in person carried or conferred personally about twenty-six laws (omitting others, within as well as without that time, issued either with his influence or at his instigation or in his interest). The subjects of these statutes concerned conditions referable to these rubrics: administrative, agrarian, criminal, economic, financial, foreign, judicial, municipal, political, provincial, religious. Of these laws, though most may be lauded for manifesting superior statecraft contributing to intelligent improvement of both civic and imperial interests, yet some either showed simply political partisanship or merely treated temporary matters.

Since many modern scholars have canvassed competently this theme, I think that from me no new reinterpretation is required. So to you I propose to present of Caesar's legislative labors an aspect, whereto, so far as I am aware, has been attracted no attention save in a short sentence set here and there both in biographies about him and in books on Roman history and on Roman law.

According to Suetonius, Caesar in his fourth dictatorship, which was also the last year of his life (45-44), desired "to reduce the civil law (*ius civile*) to a fixed limit and from the immense and diffuse abundance of laws to collect all the best and necessary ones into very few books" (*Iul.* 44.2).

Doubtless such design seemed desirable, since scholars have assembled evidence for at least 575 laws either enacted (as *leges rogatae*) by Roman assemblies or emitted (as *leges datae*) by Roman magistrates from the foundation of the Republic in 510 through 46, after which date Caesar's decision may be considered to have caused some start on this condensation. Without suggesting (1) that some of these statutes, of

course, had been revoked, whether by political rescission or because they had been promulgated for a purpose no longer pertinent, (2) that almost 50 so-called royal laws (*leges regiae*) anterior to 510 repose outside the above reckoning, (3) that the *Twelve Tables* (*Duodecim Tabulae sive Lex Duodecim Tabularum*), Rome's first code (ratified in 449), then had preserved more than its present 140-odd provisions and after Caesar's generation still was glorified as the source of all public and private law, (4) that more than the sum of all these statutes (*leges et plebiscita*) must have existed, but that now evidence for such laws is lost, (5) that not a few of the known 25 *senatusconsults* (*senatus consulta*) of this period still possessed legal force — such a monumental mass may have seemed to require reduction to some system. Moreover, we have contemporary corroboration of Suetonius' statement about the accumulation of statutes, since Livy, who composed his *Ab Urbe Condita* soon after the collapse of the Republic in 27 B.C., while silent about Caesar's plan, whose perfection Caesar's assassination apparently prevented, yet speaks of "the present immense mass of laws piled on laws" (3.34.6).

Although no ancient author has professed why Caesar proposed the project of codifying Roman Law—as Caesar's plan "to reduce the civil law" commonly is regarded—, yet it seems that this scheme was not original with Caesar, but had occurred to at least one of his contemporaries, if we take as true the testimony of St. Isidore of Seville, who in his *Origines sive Etymologiae* says that Pompey, Caesar's son-in-law (59-54), in his first consulship (70) "wished to institute the reduction of the laws in books, but did not persevere through fear of detractors" (5.1.5). Thus the idea then appears to have been in the air and it may have inspired Caesar to attempt what his late and luckless antagonist had abandoned. Perhaps Caesar also was prompted by an allied proposal adumbrated by Cicero, "Rome's least mortal mind," who in his *De Oratore* (as early as 55) had considered (2.142) another contribution to the political portion of his philosophical cyclopaedia in the *De Iure Civili in Artem Redigendo*. How much of this essay Cicero elaborated is not certain: all that survives are one (short) sentence and one word. Another conjecture is that Caesar's purpose proceeded from his more comprehensive plan for the whole Commonwealth's unification under one head.

Whether Caesar appointed a commission or assigned only one man for this codification is

not known. But if a conjecture may be conceded, the most probable candidate either for the single post or as the chief of commissioners would have been Gaius Trebatius Testa, the protégé of Cicero, whose commendation of him to Caesar in 54 (Cicero, *Fam.* 7.5) secured for him a place, perhaps the principal place, on Caesar's proconsular staff. Author of a ten-volume work, *De Religionibus*, on sacral and pontifical law, and of a treatise on civil law, *De Iure Civili*, Trebatius lived long enough to enjoy also the favor of Augustus, who frequently consulted him and on him may have conferred the rewarding cachet of the *ius respondendi* (the right of issuing responses with imperial authority, when asked by laymen about legal affairs). This juriscult's reputation is recognized justly in Justinian's *Digesta* (533), where his *peritia* in jurisprudence is praised (1.2.2.45).

The Suetonian statement rather definitely denies reference to magisterial law (*ius honorarium*), that is, the *corpus* of annual edicts (*edicta*) emitted both by magistrates in Rome and by provincial governors, who received the right of pronouncing proclamations (*ius edicendi*), wherein they imparted information about their procedure on claims in cases presented to them throughout their tenure. Though the contents of these edicts continued without excessive change, so that their core was called the *edictum tralatitium* (because it thus was transmitted from year to year), yet contradictions, conflicts, confusions, caprices, crookednesses of judgement—consider Cicero's citations (70) from vicious Gaius Verres' praetorian and provincial edicts—had grown so great and had added so much to the onerous abuses observed in any judicial order anywhere and anytime operated by man, that a considerable cry for their revision must have received conspicuous recognition during the dying days of the Republic. But relief was reserved until the Empire, when Hadrian had (ca. 132) Lucius Octavius Cornelius Publius Salvius Iulianus Aemilianus (100?-?169), commonly called Julian (regarded by many as the most representative juriscult of Roman jurisprudence), revise and reduce at least the urban praetorian edict—perhaps also the aedilician edict—into an imperial perpetual edict (*edictum perpetuum*), whereby, in effect, the emperor ended the praetors' independent interpretation of the law, whereof they had been—so to speak—the living voice (*viva vox*) in their activity as aiding or supplementing or correcting the civil law in the interests of equity and of utility.

Suetonius' statement (*stricto sensu*), may

mean no more than that Caesar contemplated the collection of statutes into some sort of systematized scheme. But such a proposition, then conceived and not completed, was postponed for more than three centuries and then only was produced unofficially in the *Codex Gregorianus* (ca. 294), which collected imperial constitutions (*constitutiones principis sive principum placita*) issued in Hadrian's reign (117-138) onward. This concoction was continued also unofficially by the *Codex Hermogenianus* (ca. 365), which carried thus the former collection forward for two generations. Nothing is known concerning either compiler, who may have had a post in the imperial chancery or may have professed law in some school, perhaps at Beirut. Each codex has come to us only in citations conserved in later sylloges and each codex has served as an admitted source for later authorized codes. The first official compilation of laws was constructed at the command of Theodosius II (r. 408-450), who instructed (435) a commission to collect all imperial constitutions adopted in Constantine I's reign (306-337) onward. The *Codex Theodosianus* (approved on 15 February 438) appeared in sixteen books, of which ample portions are preserved. Justinian I likewise instituted (528) a commission to compile imperial constitutions ranging from Hadrian's reign onward. But this edition (accepted on 7 April 529) was recalled for replacement by a revised edition (affirmed on 16 November 534). This *Codex Iustinianianus*, the last codification of laws in classical antiquity, comprised 12 books, still mostly complete, and contained much of the material admitted into the three anterior collections.

And, finally, there was another area wherein Caesar could have carried reform: the responses (*responsa*) of the juriconsults (*iuris consulti*, *iuris periti*, *iuris prudentes*), those competent representatives of the Roman courts, whose laudable labors both in teaching and in writing and in interpreting played such an eminent part in the evolution of Roman Law and whose learned opinions obtained an acknowledged authority often only a little less than that of the law itself. Although the Golden Age of Roman Jurisprudence appeared in the Early Empire, yet the gloriously glittering galaxy of leading legal lights prominent in the Principate seemed to shine with brighter brilliance, only because their own radiance was reflected from the gleaming glow still seen in those scintillant stars whose veteran virtues in their love for the law had been renowned in the Late Republic. But among

the republican juriconsults, of whom almost two score have been noted by scholars, stand seven, whose names, great in their generation, should lead any roster of Roman lawyers: Publius Mucius Scaevola Pontifex Maximus (cos. 133), Quintus Mucius Scaevola Augur (cos. 117), Publius Rutilius Rufus (cos. 105), Quintus Mucius Scaevola Pontifex Maximus (cos. 95), Gaius Aquilius Gallus (*praet.* 66), Servius Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51), and Gaius Trebatius Testa (*ob. post.* 30).

What Caesar could not accomplish, if he possibly had proposed to create order from the juriconsults' conflicting opinions, that Justinian I was able to achieve. For he commanded (530) a commission to revise by reduction the texts of the juriconsults' treatises, to select what they considered suitable for the contemporary situation, to excise all that was ambiguous, contradictory, obsolete, repetitious, superfluous, to add what appeared conducive to clarity. Enough evidence exists to prove that this process involved considerable change and not a little interpolation, but the result was the really remarkable *Digesta sive Pandectae* (published on 16 December 533) in 50 books, containing over 9,000 texts from over 2,000 treatises and comprising not only a lasting but also a living legacy of Roman Law.

Sic habent sua fata proposita.

P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

CAESAR, THE MAN OF LETTERS

Author's note: The following is in no sense a formal research paper as will at once be obvious. It represents the substance of remarks made during participation in the panel discussion indicated and is not intended as an exhaustive treatment of the subject concerned. It is felt, however, that little of the available material has been neglected.

No inquiry into the subject of "Caesar, the Man of Letters," could reasonably limit itself to a study of the extant writings involved. Indeed, the works that have survived, the *Commentarii* and the few letters embedded in the correspondence of Cicero, are hardly literature in the usual sense, i.e., *belles lettres*. It is proposed, therefore, to consider what is known of Caesar's lost works, by title whenever possible, and what the ancients had to say about the writings represented, then to examine somewhat summarily the works that have come down to us and the ancient comments upon them.

Three works at least of Caesar fall into

the category of *juvenilia*. Suetonius (*Iul.* 56.7) records that Caesar as a boy and youth wrote a *Laudes Herculis*, a tragedy called *Oedipus*, and a work known as *Dicta collectanea* (cf. *Cic. Fam.* 9.16.4), evidently a collection of apophthegms. The failure of these writings to survive is due no doubt in part to a letter written by Augustus to his librarian, Maecius, in which he forbade their publication (Suet. *loc. cit.*).

Pliny (*Ep.* 5.3.5) mentions some erotic verses which may be the *carmina* referred to by Tacitus in a passage (*Dial.* 21.6) where he remarks that Caesar and Brutus wrote poetry no better than that of Cicero, but that they were more fortunate in that *illos fecisse [scil. carmina] pauciores sciunt*. Caesar wrote as well a poem entitled *Iter* (Suet. *Iul.* 56.5) of which nothing is known except that it was produced during a twenty-four day journey from Rome to Farther Spain. Plutarch (*Caes.* 2.2) tells us that Caesar wrote poems (and speeches) while a captive of the pirates who seized him on his return from Bithynia. A remark of Plutarch's makes it clear that all of his audience was not appreciative. In *FPL* 91 we find the famous epigram to Terence as a *puri sermonis amator*. The epigrams attributed to Caesar in the various editions of the Latin Anthology are of dubious authorship.

In prose Caesar wrote a philological treatise, the *De analogia*, on the niceties of language (Suet. *Iul.* 56.4; Gellius *N.A.* 19.8). This work, in two books, was written while the author was crossing the Alps on return to his army in Hither Gaul (Suet. *loc. cit.*), but was apparently a sound work, much admired and quoted. It is excerpted and discussed at length by Gellius (*ibid.*) in the mouth of Fronto, who refers to Caesar as *sermonis praeter alios suae aetatis castissimi* (*ibid.* 3). The books were dedicated to Cicero (*ibid.*), which fact in itself is enough to recommend their contents. Elsewhere (*Ad Ant. Imp. De bello Parthico*, Naber, p. 217) Fronto refers to the books as *scrupulosissimos*. In reply to Cicero's eulogy of Cato, Caesar produced two books known as *Anticatores* (Suet. *Iul.* 56.5; Plutarch *Caes.* 3.2; 54.2-3). Plutarch (*Caes.* 54.3) writes that both treatises had many eager readers "as well because of Caesar as of Cato." The *De astris*, a work on astronomy (Macr. *Sat.* 1.16.39; Pliny *N.H.* 1.207), and the *Libri auspiorum* or *Auguralia* (Macr. *Sat.* 1.16.29; Priscian 6, p. 719 ed. Putsch) are both lost.

Caesar's orations, as is known, are likewise not extant and our best source for a knowledge of his ability in this field is Sallust's familiar

report of his speech in the Catilinarian debate. The following "titles" are known: *Pro Sardis* (Suet. *Iul.* 55.2), *Pro Q. Metello* (*ibid.* 3, q.v. on authenticity), *Apud milites in Hispania* (*ibid.* 4, q.v. on authenticity), *Pro Bithynis* (Gellius *N.A.* 5.13.6), *Qua Plautiam Rogationem suasit* (*ibid.* 13.3.5), *Pro Decio Samnite* (Tac. *Dial.* 21.6), and *In Dolabellam actio* (Suet. *Iul.* 55.1, also 4.1; Gellius *N.A.* 4.16.8; Plutarch *Caes.* 4.1-2, etc.). The ancients were unanimous in praise of Caesar in the field of oratory both from the standpoint of literary achievement and delivery (see, e.g., Suet. *Iul.* 55 and Cicero *Brutus* 261).

Little need be said of the extant *Commentarii de bello Gallico* and *de bello civili*, for they are their own best advocates. Ancient opinion does, however, deserve consideration. Cicero (*Brutus* 262) speaks of the *Commentarii de bello Gallico* as follows: *probandos . . . nudi, recti, venusti*, and uses the phrase *omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta* in his discussion of them. Hirtius' familiar eulogy in the preface of his continuation is acceptable even though it is clearly inspired to a great degree by love of Caesar. He sums up Caesar's literary qualities as evinced in the Gallic Commentaries as follows (*Commentarii de bello Gallico*, 8. pref. 7): (1) *facultas scribendi*, (2) *summa elegantia scribendi*, and (3) *verissima scientia suorum consiliorum explicandorum*. Only the voice of Asinius Pollio dissents. In Suet. *Iul.* 56.4 he is reported to have felt that the *Commentarii de bello Gallico* had been written *parum diligenter* and *parum integra veritate* and that Caesar's intention had been to rewrite and revise them.

Our opinion of Caesar as an epistolographer must be based on the reading of the letters preserved in the correspondence of Cicero.¹

The foregoing is, then, about all we know of Caesar as a literary man. One matter does, however, invite further speculation. Sihler² observed years ago "that at no time these relations [i.e., the *Commentarii de bello Gallico*] became a schoolbook for Roman youth." In support of this statement he cites the following statistics: "The Indices of Keil's *Grammatici Latini* contain, roughly, 6000 references to Vergil, Cicero is cited about 1000 times, Horace 700, Sallust 400; but Caesar's Gallic War is mentioned but twice." Sihler adds: "We may confidently say that this work was unknown and unused as a text-book of the grammaticus, whether in the capital or in the provinces." This evident un-

1. Att. 9.6A; 9.7C; 9.16.2; 9.13A.1; 9.14.1; 10.8B.

2. E. G. Sihler, *Annals of Caesar* (New York 1911) 265.

popularity of the Gallic Commentaries as a schoolbook may be explained by one or more of the following considerations: (1) they were written in prose, whereas poetry was favored as a vehicle of instruction (however, see Sihler's statistics above for Cicero and Sallust); (2) they are in no way related to the Greek tradition, which was the basis of Roman instruction; (3) they provided little or no material for the composition of *suasoriae*; (4) only Rome and Italy would have approved of the content of the Gallic Commentaries; and (5) Augustus may not have wanted Caesar to be kept constantly in the minds of the people lest they be reminded of the past civil wars, of Caesar's "plans for absolute monarchy," and the like, all of which would have militated against the healing of old wounds, the establishment of the Pax Augusta, etc.

Of the above points, numbers 4 and 5 require some enlargement. Point 4: only Rome and Italy would have approved of the content of the Gallic Commentaries for the obvious reason that provincial schoolmasters and students, especially those of Gaul, would have resented the depiction of Roman arms as ever victorious over the "lesser breeds" of the provinces. The use of the Gallic Commentaries in the schools of Gaul might even have inclined the people toward rebellion. Further to point 5: it is possible that Augustus feared that his efforts to maintain his position as *princeps* by subtle constitutional means might suffer were Caesar and "Caesarism" kept before the eyes of the young. We do know, as mentioned above, that Augustus suppressed publication of Caesar's *juvenilia*, and his disregard of Vergil's will at a later date is further proof that he did not refrain from exercising his powers in literary matters when he thought that public interest was involved. It is at any rate surprising to realize that Caesar's *Commentarii de bello Gallico*, so long an integral part of the Latin curriculum with us and one of the most impressive monuments to Roman military might and organization, had to wait for centuries before it became a schoolbook in western, i.e., Romanized, Europe.

WILLIAM T. AVERY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

RHETORICAL DEVICES IN CAESAR'S COMMENTARIES

When, some weeks ago, I received Professor Latimer's kind invitation to participate in one of these panels, and learned that the subject

was to be CAESAR, I was reminded of that facetious old radio gag, "What's new in antiques?" I recalled that spoofing singing-commercial of demure high school students:

Caesar was a Roman, as dead as dead can be . . .

But then I consoled myself with that familiar line of wise old Terence:

Nullumst iam dictum quod non sit dictum prius.

After two thousand years, what can be said today that is new about that dead Roman? Certainly not in the *matter*, for libraries all over the world are still trying to find more room for all kinds of Caesarian paraphernalia. Anything *new*, if there be such data, will have to be in the *manner* of rendition, like "putting old wine in a new bottle." And so, as I looked back over 45 years of teaching Caesar, I wondered that, after 2000 years, we, presumably intelligent people, can still allow ourselves to be hypnotized, as it were, by his verbal magic. Is he indeed a roaming Roman, a reincarnated "Bridey Murphy," returning from the classical underworld to be present at these commemorative exercises and to exhibit his supernatural power once again? And then that word "hypnotized" gave me an idea—to present Caesar in a new and strange guise as a Verbal Hypnotist!

Now, I do not pretend to know anything about hypnotism or this popular craze for delving into one's Sub-conscious or Un-conscious, but, I believe, the underlying principle of this exhumation is, by the influence of constant suggestion, to induce an artificial state resembling sleep wherein the subject (or patient or victim) submits his or her will to the power of another, passes into a condition of heightened suggestibility and thus permits himself to be charmed, or mesmerized, or bewitched, or entranced, as if by some magical incantation of a voodoo medicine man. At any rate, this seems to me to be what Caesar appears to have done for two hundred decades and is still doing to us right now, dominating us with alluring sound effects, a kind of musical therapy, like the background music of a movie or the insistent echolalia of a TV singing-commercial.

Well, are not these daily phenomena just modern versions of those ancient principles of oratory, the purpose of which is, as Cicero says somewhere, *placere et persuadere*? For the orator or writer, yes, even the teacher who with sesquipedalian verbiage often puts his helpless pupils to sleep (but does not know the trick of waking them out of their trance), must first

win over his audience to his point of view (his will) and then, appealing to sensory, motor, and memory faculties, by a pleasing succession of sound hold its attention to his will and then drive his subjects on to accept and to "buy" his line of merchandise. And here are we, of our own choice, hypnotized, "stuck with our bill of goods." But—*mirabile dictu*—we love it. All our volition is suspended because we, willing victims, *want* to be persuaded.

With this idea in mind, I thought it would be an interesting experiment to delve once more into Caesar's style. I took a brand-new copy of the seven *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* and, with a red pencil, began to mark off the *sound effects* (Caesar should always be read *ALoud*) and to consider these phenomena in the light of Caesar as an Orator, a General, a Statesman, and as a Man of Letters. However, to present all these findings would take several hours and it would be impossible to discuss them in the few minutes allotted to me on this panel. It is principally Caesar the Orator with whom we are concerned here.

Of the three leading kinds of oratory as taught by Greek and Roman rhetoricians, Caesar, perhaps because of aristocratic heritage and nurture, preferred the Attic, the direct, simple, unadorned style as against the ornate, flamboyant Asiatic of Hortensius, that great rival of Cicero, who himself, though adept in any kind, usually preferred the middle-of-the-road type, the Rhodian.

As a result, we have in the Orator's magic "bag of tricks" three kinds of figures, expressions of ideas in a fanciful manner with artistic effect to charm the ears and the minds of his audience for the sake of diversity, impressiveness, vividness, strength, and distinction: Figures of Rhetoric, of Syntax, and of Speech.

You recall that Cicero in his *Brutus*, that famous history of Roman oratory, in commenting on Caesar's *Commentarii*, says that they are "*nudi, recti, venusti*." By *nudi*, I am certain he meant 'stripped' of all rhetorical ornamentation (Figures of Speech), as simple and naked as a beautiful Greek statue. And certainly they are as direct and straightforward as befits a great general who knew how to command others as well as himself (most of the time). Also, to one who can read Latin fluently, they are *venusti*, 'charming,' if not beautiful in their simple elegance.

But before considering the individual figures, a few comments on Caesar's apparently peculiar

style are in order. The most obvious is his use of the Impersonal Third Singular—nothing new to ancient Greek historians. This artifice is very disarming in itself at the very outset and puts the reader into a frame of mind to submit to suggestion and then to continue to peruse the story without thinking of the real protagonist who lurks behind the scenes and unassumingly "blows his own horn," without stepping into the spotlight with that irritating big *I*.

Then, there is the persistent use of the Historical Present; and I might mention about half-a-dozen Historical Infinitives (three of them in 1.16) to lend speed, vividness, excitement, the ancient equivalent of our TV (I like to call it the Television Tense), which brings the past to life before our eyes with a "You Are There" effect. For example, in his very first appearance on the stage of his operations, in 1.7:

Caesari, cum id nuntiatum esset eos per provinciam nostram iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci et, quam maximis potest itineribus, in Galliam ulteriorem contendit et ad Genavam pervenit.

Here is an eight-day jaunt, over six hundred miles, accomplished with speed and all briefed in one simple, swift sentence. Here we have three Historical Presents combined with a triple comparative, alliteration, asyndeton, anaphora and stunning climax. That's Caesar—Speed and Surprise!

Further, we find the very frequent use of that bane of high school students, Indirect Discourse, comprising Indirect Statements and Indirect Questions. Here again, Caesar disarms his audience by his apparent telling of the Truth, as would any experienced reporter who does not feel justified in quoting the exact words (which Caesar rarely does, and then only of others who were real participants or actual eyewitnesses). Further details may be found in any text of Caesar.

Now as to Figures in particular. First, those of *Rhetoric*, which appeal to the *mind*, through the senses, especially the ears. Here Caesar reveals himself mainly as the Orator, the Verbal Hypnotist. One of the most frequent and most obvious is

Alliteration, the repetition of the same letter at the beginning of successive words to produce a euphonious combination. Caesar is particularly partial to *p*'s (often combined with the other labials, *b*'s and *f*'s), like "*facile perpauci prohibere possent; alterum per provinciam . . .*"

and other examples too numerous to quote. There is also a fondness for the hard c's: "*concilio convocato consolaturs cohortatusque*." Is this purely coincidental? Perhaps, if occurring only twice but not when you get a plethora, three, four, five, yes, even a dozen or more, as we find with the smooth, sibilant s's which I shall deal with under Assonance. Then it is deliberate and intended for effect, "putting on an act," as we say.

Anaphora, the frequent repetition of the same word in successive phrases or clauses, such as *si, quod, quid, alter*, etc., with the effect of strong and increasing emphasis. Here speaks Caesar, the Commanding General.

Antithesis, expressing contrast or opposition by the use of balance or parallelism of words or ideas, to make meaning stand out in bold relief. Again, Caesar the General and the Statesman speaking, especially in speeches and descriptions of battle-scenes with their flux until the crowning victory.

Assonance (naturally very common in all highly inflected languages), that close recurrence of similar sounds in initial syllables but more especially in the middle or end of words. This is particularly true of the hissing, sibilant, snaky, sinuous s sounds, so frequent that they hypnotize us and sweep us along obliviously, just as I, reading and fancifully riding along with Caesar as he swoops down upon unsuspecting Gauls and Germans and Britons, forgot my purpose, merely to assemble their dead skeletons-in-armor and make them rattle once more with literary vividness for our scholarly pleasure.

One of the best illustrations, you will remember, is that stirring episode in 2.6, where Iccius, the double-crossing leader of the quitting Remi, is trapped in the town of Bibrax by 296,000 revengeful Belgian warriors, and sends his urgent message which startled Caesar out of his sleep, at midnight, and caused the apprehensive Roman to despatch his Numidian and Cretan bowmen and light-armed and light-footed Balearic slingers on the double-quick as a relief to the beleaguered townsmen. Listen again to those alarming, significant and suggestive s-s-s-s sounds which still seem to sparkle and spurt like a wireless SOS with its cry for immediate help: "*Nisi subsidium sibi summittatur, sese diutius sustinere non posse*". Iccius certainly meant that whether or not he wrote the call in Gaulish, or possibly even in Latin, but it was Caesar, the Orator, who transcribed it and still transmits it throughout the ages.

Chiasmus, the so-called Greek criss-cross order in two contrasting phrases, an arrangement not common in Caesar but employed at intervals to make an Antithesis more striking. Here Caesar, the Man of Letters, lends variety and change of rhythm.

Climax, the "ladder," developing and arranging series of ideas so that they gradually increase in impressiveness like a musical crescendo. This is true of all the campaigns in each of the seven books. Caesar knew how to build up his effects. He would have made a good playwright. Each campaign, each book has the unity of a compact one-act play, the Greek ideal of Unity of Time, Place, Action.

Anti-Climax, a gradual (but often an abrupt) change in the importance or tone of ideas, like a musical decrescendo, particularly noticeable in Book III, and in V, with their side-campaigns of Caesar's *legati*, and in the summary of results.

Litotes, an understatement denying the opposite affirmative. Perhaps we may count in this group such expressions as "*non nulli*", "*non multum*," etc.

Repetition (often accompanied by *Anaphora*), rather frequently used to lend additional force and to produce a sustained effect.

Rhetorical Questions, equivalent to declarative sentences, emphatic assertions put in the interrogative form for rhetorical effect, principally in the few speeches directly quoted, mostly in V and VII.

Rhythm—for every Greek and Roman orator was taught to write verse (not necessarily poetry) to develop flexibility in the use of words. Almost every sentence, even abrupt statements and transitions, have this cadence reenforced by the orator's other rhetorical devices. This would include Crescendo, Decrescendo, Metrical Endings, and even Rime. Hence, again, Caesar should be read and studied ALOUD.

Interesting combinations which intrigued me by their "Rock 'n Roll" (not to mention many doublets and lengthy superlatives) are:

pabulationibus populationibusque (1.15)
frumentationibus pabulationibusque (7.64),

Gaulic war-cries for our modern Indians and Davy Crocketts. To me their martial beat, though somewhat rough, like Ennius, sounds like trochaics. Perhaps Shakespeare himself with his "little Latin" may have been thinking of these in *Love's Labor's Lost* (V.1) in spoofing that Latin pedant with his *honorificabilitudinitatibusque*. Who knows? But there's a nice agglutin-

ation of Third Declension stems and endings!

Symmetry, that proper balance in form and sound of words, phrases, and clauses, resulting in an effect of due proportion and *harmony* between the parts of a whole sentence, paragraph or *liber*, the constant, almost Ciceronian, balance of long and short sentences. Was it this that Cicero meant in calling the Commentaries "*venusti*"?

As for *Figures of Syntax*, whose appeal is primarily to the *intellect* through striking and unusual grammatical arrangements of parts of sentences, these are employed for the sake of greater clearness, emphasis, or vividness. The most common devices of this class are:

Asyndeton, the intentional omission of connectives between all members of a series of words, phrases, or clauses; characteristic of vivid, rapid narrative. The lively succession of events without conjunctions generates an atmosphere of abruptness, speed, force, omitting all unnecessary words or details, and producing the disconnected effect of a musical staccato, marked by abrupt, sharp emphasis. Here speaks the General, with his will set on Speed and Surprise to accomplish his goal—*divide et impera*.

Polysyndeton, the reverse, with an overabundance of conjunctions (not counting correlatives), connecting each and every one of the members of a series of words, phrases, or clauses, producing the smooth-flowing effect of a musical legato, so that our minds linger over each unit and we are impressed by the numerosity of details.

Ellipsis, the omission from a sentence of some integral part, such as forms of *esse* of compound tenses of the Passive, or Infinitives, especially the Future Active, usually necessary for the sense but whose meaning may be implied by the context. Again—Caesar and Speed.

Syncope, another indication of Speed, almost poetic, of stripping forms of words, especially verbs, down to their bare bones: like *-arunt*, *-asse*, *-assent*, etc.

As for *Figures of Speech*, which appeal to the *heart* and emotions, to stimulate and inspire the imagination, remember that Caesar was writing as a General stating *Facts*: "*facta, non verba*." Remember what Cicero said about *nudi*. And yet we seem to recall a few instances of *Simile*, if we may include such military expressions as used in the description of Vesontio surrounded by the river Dubis, *ut circino*, or speaking of those *lilia* for impeding cavalry as *similitudinis floris*, or the Nervian hedges as *instar*

muri, or the panic of enemies as *similis fugae*.

Perhaps, with some indulgence, we may consider such military terms as *testudo*, *vinea*, *phalanx*, *aries* as originally soldier slang use of *Metonymy*, or defunct *Metaphors*. And lastly, *Hyperbole*, if we are to believe some naive modern biographers picturing Caesar as "drawing the long bow" and telling more than the Truth in his desire to impress his Roman readers with an exaggerated sense of his own importance and the importance of his conquests for the glorious SPQR. Need we mention his fascinating descriptions of the strange animals in the, to him, impenetrable forests, or that pitiful spectacle of the Nervii being reduced from 60,000 fighters to scarcely 500?

But disregarding all rhetorical devices, can you name any general, ancient or modern, whose memoirs can compare with those of Caesar for Clearness, for Force, or even for Elegance?

* * *

And now, in conclusion, may I use one of Caesar's own tricks? When the going gets rough and the fighting gets tough, he injects a bit of drama, like an orator, to wake up his sleeping, hypnotized audience. Here is a pack of cigarettes. It contains on its face Caesar's most famous words, three simple words, like the lover's "I love you" or St. Paul's "Faith, Hope, Charity"; three little words, pregnant with meaning, which he wrote from Asia to Amantius, obviously his Public Relations man in Rome, after his great victory over Pharnaces, son of Mithridates the Great, in the battle of Zela; three words which his agent later had painted on canvas to be carried in Caesar's quadruple triumphal procession up the Sacra Via to the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline; three eloquent words that crystallize the most important Rhetorical Devices; just three words that combine:

Three dissyllables,

A "trimeter," made up of three spondees to give rhythm and cadence,

Triple alliteration,

Triple assonance,

Double asyndeton

—and finally, a sudden start, a stirring crescendo, ending in a stunning

Climax:

veni - vidi - VICI.

And now, if you please, I'll smoke one of Caesar's own cigarettes!

CHARLES W. SIEDLER
WALTON HIGH SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY

EDITORIAL NOTE

In addition to the articles here published, the Friday afternoon panel session, on "Caesar, The General," under the moderatorship of Prof. Martin R. P. McGuire, Catholic University of America, included papers on Caesar's Helvetian Campaign, by Gen. Donald A. Armstrong, Director, Editorial Advisory Services, Washington, D. C., and on Caesar's Invasion of Britain, by Mr. Ross Heasley, a senior student at Anacostia High School, Washington. The Saturday sessions, on "Caesar, The Statesman" and "Caesar, the Man of Letters," moderated, respectively, by Dr. John F. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, and Dean Lloyd W. Daly, University of Pennsylvania, also included papers on certain inscriptions pertaining to Caesar, by Prof. Antony E. Raubitschek, Princeton University, and on the *Fortleben* of Caesar, by Prof. Bernard M. Peebles, Catholic University of America. Mr. Morris Rosenblum, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., another scheduled speaker, was unfortunately unable to appear.

It is hoped that some of these papers, or portions thereof, can be published at a later date. A short supplement to Prof. Siedler's article will follow.

The Editor joins the officials of C.A.A.S. and the members of the local committee in thanking the participants, scheduled and unscheduled, whose contributions, prepared or extemporaneously offered in the lively discussions which emerged, provided one of the most enjoyable and instructive meetings in recent years.

REVIEWS and NOTES AND NEWS, casualties of Caesar's posthumous triumph, will resume in No. 3, October 26, 1956.

BOOKS RECEIVED

BOVIE, SMITH PALMER (trans.). *Virgil's Georgics: A Modern English Verse Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. Pp. xxx, 111. \$3.75.

MARIOTTA, SCEVOLA. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio*. Saggio con edizione dei frammenti del *Bellum Poenicum*. ("Studi e Saggi.") Rome: Angelo Signorelli, 1955. Pp. 151. L. 800.

RICHTER, GISELA M. A. *Catalogue of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*. ("Dumbarton Oaks Catalogues.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956. Pp. xiii, 77; 27 pl. \$5.00.

VELLACOTT, PHILIP (trans.). *Aeschylus, The Oresteian Trilogy: Agamemnon, The Choephoroi, The Eumenides*. ("Penguin Classics," L67.) Harmondsworth (Middlesex) - Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1956. Pp. 201. \$0.65.

NOW for the First Time you can read the Helvetian Campaign by word-order method.

NEW filmstrip, moving one word at a time on your screen before your eyes.

NOW you can analyze each form as it appears in its proper place in the developing sentence.

DOUBLE-FRAME HORIZONTAL projection for use with an ARGUS with filmstrip adapter or any machine permitting gradual projection.

*Not suitable for machines which must project complete frame each change. Text of **USING LATIN, BOOK TWO**, Scott. Foresman & Co. by permission of the publishers.

Product of RICHARD H. WALKER

—Ten Dollars—

TUTOR THAT NEVER TIRES, INC.

Bronxville, New York